

Sheila Stoeller



0000107686

From: Linda Kennedy [lkennedy@wildblue.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2010 5:10 PM
To: Mayes-WebEmail; Pierce-Web; Newman-Web; Kennedy-Web; Stump-Web
Subject: DOCKET NO. E-01575A-08-0328 - SSVEC

ORIGINAL

Arizona Corporation Commission
Chairman Kristin Mayes
Commissioners Kennedy, Newman, Pierce, and Stump

DOCKET NO. E-01575A-08-0328 — 4 items

Dear Chairman Mayes and Commissioners:

I understand that Sulphur Springs Valley Electrical Cooperative (SSVEC) has petitioned the ACC for permission to begin construction immediately on the proposed 69kV line to the Sonoita/Patagonia/Elgin area. I urge you not to grant this petition. You directed SSVEC to conduct a feasibility study, hold public hearings to discuss the findings of the feasibility study and to incorporate public comment. The feasibility study was a waste of time and money without the other two aspects – public hearings and incorporation of community members.

The feasibility study pointed out several very important elements including:

- Customers experienced an average of only 3 hours of outage per year based on the past 10 years and 90% of all outages affected 3 or fewer customers.
- Lightning and birds caused far more outages (~330 and ~300, respectively) than overload (less than 30) over the past 10 years. Outages occurred primarily on the feeder lines, not on the existing V7 line.
- None of the alternatives, including the proposed 69kV line, will solve the reliability issue unless feeder loads are addressed.
- Other options, including the combination of a realistic Time of Use program, distributed renewable energy, peaker plants, and demand-side management are more effective, less expensive and have fewer negative impacts on aesthetics, the environment, and cultural sites than the proposed line.

A properly executed series of public hearings will foster constructive dialogue on the issues. Information from those hearings should be used to design a workable, strategic plan to address the energy reliability issue using logic rather than rhetoric.

Sincerely,

Linda Kennedy
H.C. 1 Box 44
Elgin, AZ 85611

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

JAN 22 2010

DOCKETED BY	AMT
-------------	-----

Sheila Stoeller

From: Lee Sims [leesims2@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2010 4:52 PM
To: Mayes-WebEmail
Subject: SSVEC Sonoita Reliability Project

Dear Chairman Mayes:

Last summer, your decision to block SSVEC's 69 Kv line to Sonoita and to order SSVEC to conduct an alternative power study was seriously flawed. Even I a retired engineer, but still a lay person in these matters knew that there were no alternative systems to replace the 69 Kv line. Solar and wind, widely in use today, are not productive most of the day and some times for days on end which means that a backup line would be necessary. Other systems are experimental and costly and SSVEC is not in the research business. I knew that and I am certain that ACC engineers knew that, so why the adverse decision against SSVEC? They had presented a sound engineering case for the 69 Kv line to improve reliability to the 2400 Whetstone, Elgin, Sonoita and Patagonia SSVEC members. The V7 line which serves the area is the longest (350 miles) in the SSVEC inventory and has the most outages. Were you possibly influenced by the glowering NIMBYs in the audience? That's not a good reason.

Now the \$350,000 study by Navigant Consulting has been completed and delivered and SSVEC has been thoroughly vindicated. Their plan for a 69 Kv sub transmission line and a substation in Sonoita is the best way to improve reliability in the V7 area. Not one of the dissident recommended alternatives proved feasible and all were examined by Navigant.

It is now time for action. I recommend that the SSVEC Reliability Project be placed on the ACC agenda as soon as possible.

Lee Sims, P. E., retired
PO Box 206
Sonoita Az 85637
Jan 21, 2010

Sheila Stoeller

From: timstorer@cox.net
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2010 3:57 PM
To: Newman-Web; Mayes-WebEmail
Subject: SSVEC

Dear Commissioners Newman and Mayes;

I am a resident of Sonoita, and have recently submitted comments concerning SSVEC hearings. I just want to say how concerned I am with the deteriorating situation between SSVEC and the cooperative members in our area. The rancor over the request to build a new line, the recent REST hearings, the tariff hearing, concerns me since there seems to be no communication between the two parties. While I favor more development of renewable energy, and feel the Company is not really interested in renewables, I feel that what we need here is a mediator, to bring the two sides together to try and resolve the issues. SSVEC seems to be in the process of spending quite a bit of our money on advertising their point of view on these issues, while not allowing members a hand in deciding our future.

If there is anything you can do to get the company to sit down and negotiate, indeed, act as a cooperative with its members, I would greatly appreciate it.

Sincerely, Tim Storer

Sheila Stoeller

From: Wayne Crane [wecrane@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2010 10:00 AM
To: Mayes-WebEmail
Subject: FW: Response to article in Sierra Vista Herald

Commissioner Mayes,

For your information.

Wayne E. Crane
Cochise, Arizona

From: wecrane@hotmail.com
To: newman-web@azcc.gov
Subject: Response to article in Sierra Vista Herald
Date: Tue, 19 Jan 2010 00:28:59 +0000

Mr. Newman,

I read your article in the January 17 issue of the Sierra Vista Herald. I live in Cochise, Arizona, and am a member of Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative.

I wanted to write you regarding three points:

1. The rebate money paid out is from each of us as ratepayers. This is rarely mentioned by anyone (including the ACC and SSVEC) when articles are placed in newspapers.

The commission some years ago approved an assessment known as REST to assess each of us a surcharge each month on each meter to fund this program from which rebates are paid. I find that many of my friends and neighbors are not aware of this even though it appears as an itemized listing on each month's bills. I think as the amount of the surcharge is increased, more of them will become aware of it.

So the rebates for someone who has the financial "wherewithall" to install a unit is subsidized by the remainder of the cooperative most of whom fall short. I'm sorry for the delay in someone's rebate, but the members of SSVEC are paying the surcharge dutifully although we won't ever see the benefit (except indirectly if some of the funds go to installations at schools and municipalities).

2. My objection to the surcharge is more than just the fact that I'll probably never be able to take advantage of the rebate program is that I wasn't given a choice as to where my contribution would go. First, I feel that photovoltaic's potential is much greater than today's product on the market. In fact, I'd be (almost) happy to pay the surcharge assessment if all of my contribution went to research and development. I have talked to friends who would be equally eager to pay the assessment if it were to go to the direct purchase of "green power." If we could have a check-off box to indicate where this assessment should go -- homeowner rebates, research and development or purchase of firm contract green power, the program would have much better buy-in and would not pit those who have the money to invest in a renewable unit against those who provide the funding.

3. Schools and municipals programs are a great idea!!! If I have to pay a monthly assessment, I'd prefer it go to one of these entities and in the process make a dent in the energy bill of a city hall or a rural school. As a taxpayer to each, I would at least be seeing some return on my "investment." I have called ACC staff and made this point and have been told that the amount paid for the schools shade program

was excessive. But my understanding is that the Commission OK'd the plan (including the cost) before SSVEC' began the program. In fact, there were press releases (from the ACC and SSVEC) and an article in SSVEC's member magazine that said Commissioners praised the program and were happy to see so much PV go into place at one time.

Thanks for "listening" to my point of view.

Wayne E. Crane
Cochise, Arizona

Hotmail: Trusted email with Microsoft's powerful SPAM protection. [Sign up now.](#)

Hotmail: Trusted email with Microsoft's powerful SPAM protection. [Sign up now.](#)